

**The People's Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria Ministry
of Higher Education and Scientific Research University
of Ammar Thelidji- Laghouat Faculty of Letters and
Foreign Languages Department of English**



The Effects of the War of 1812 on American Expansionism

**A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH
PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIRMENTS FOR MASTER DEGREE
IN CIVILIZATION AND LITERATURE**

BY:

Mr. Ben Azzouz Kouissi

Mr. Sallah Eddine Kririche

Board of Examiners:

Mr. Aribi Ibrahim

Mr.

Mr.

University of Laghouat, Supervisor.

University of Laghouat, Chairman.

University of Laghouat, Examiner.

Academic Year 2020-2022

Dedication

This work is dedicated to the closest people to us, family, friends, and all who helped this work become a reality.

Acknowledgments

Abstract

The conducted research aims at highlighting the outcomes of the 1812 war and thoroughly explaining the effect they had on the advancement of America's westward expansion, eventually establishing a solid ground for the notion that the war of 1812 did have an impact on America's expansion. To this end the following questions were asked; to what extent did the war effect expansion? What were the factors or the circumstances that the war created to push forward or encourage later expansion? How did the war effect expansion? The war was influential in later American expansion. The war affected expansion through reviving American nationalism, leading Andrew Jackson to the presidency, and ending the British-Indian alliance.

Key words: Expansion, War of 1812, Nationalism.

المُلخص

البحث الذي تم اجرائه يهدف الى ابراز نتائج حرب 1812 مع الشرح المعمق لتأثير الحرب على التوسع الغربي للولايات المتحدة الامريكية، وصولا لإنشاء علاقة ربط بين الحرب والتوسع الذي تلاها. من أجل هذه الغاية تم طرح الاسالة الاتية. الى أي مدى اثرت الحرب على التوسع؟ ما هي العوامل والظروف التي صنعتها الحرب مما ادى الى دفع وتشجيع التوسع بعدها؟ ما هي الكيفية التي اثرت بها الحرب على التوسع؟ كان للحرب تأثير على التوسع الذي تلاها، وكان للحرب تأثير عبر احياء النزعة الوطنية، الدفع بأن드로 جاكسون الى رئاسة الدولة، وكذا حل الحلف بين بريطانيا و الهندود الحمر.

كلمات مفتاحية: التوسع- حرب 1812-الوطنية.

Table of Contents

Dedication.....	2
Acknowledgements.....	3
Abstract.....	4

General Introduction

1. Statement of the Problem.....	10
2. Significance of the Study	10
3. Research Questions and Hypotheses.....	10
4. Research Techniques and Methodology.....	11
5. Thesis Structure.....	11

Chapter One – Early expansion and the road to war

Introduction.....	12
1. Early expansion.....	12
2.1 The road to the 1812 War	20
2.2. Republicans.....	21
2.3 federalists	22
Conclusion.....	25

Chapter Two: The war of 1812

Introduction.....	27
Background of the 1812 War.....	27
1 - Main causes of the war	29
1.1 Official reasons.....	29

1.1.1 Impressment of American sailors	29
1.1.2. The British support of Indians to slow American expansion.....	30
1.1.3. The British blockade of American trade	33
1.2. Unofficial reasons	35
1.2.1. War Hawks	35
1.2.2. The desire to annex Canada	36
2. The progress of the 1812 war.....	39
Conclusion.....	42

Chapter three: war outcomes and later expansion

Post-war development of American expansion.....	44
1. Nationalism	44
2.2. The rise of Jackson	48
2.2.1. Jackson and Battle of New Orleans	49
2.2.2. Lieutenant General Pakenham	50
2.2.3 British Lose Ground at the Battle of New Orleans	51
2.2.4. Battle of New Orleans Casualties	52
2.2.5. Impact of the Battle of New Orleans.....	52
2.3.1 Jackson and the Native Americans.....	52
2.3.2. Indian Treaties and the Removal Act of 1830.....	54
2.3.3. The Trail of Tears (Robert Lindneux, 1942)	55
3. The loss of British support	56
Conclusion.....	58
General Conclusion.....	59.

Works cited

Works cited.....	62
------------------	----

General Introduction

US expansion:

Territorial expansion was the backbone of American culture, present from the days of early settlers and the mayflower accords, this led to expansion being engraved in the American personality and ideals. The idea of expansion was one of the reasons that drove the revolutionary war, the same spirit later grew to put the future of the young nation at stakes for the second time in a conflict with the world foremost power of Great Britain for the sake of expansion and settlement among other causes.

Literary Review:

After reading through many sources being books, articles, and websites, we found the most relevant were in order of reading: the book; *The Civil War of 1812: American Citizens, British Subjects, Irish Rebels, and Indian Allies* by Alan Taylor, published in 2010, looks into how the War of 1812 reshaped America and reignited the battle between Americans and British for control of North America. Taylor contends that the Conflict of 1812 was a civil war that almost divided the country and the North American continent. The book describes how the conflict nearly led to New England seceding from the United States. The book also discusses how the war pitted loyalist American immigrants who had fled to Canada following the Revolutionary War against recent American immigrants who held anti-British sentiments and were pro-American independence, as well as recent Irish immigrants who already held anti-British sentiments prior to the war. Furthermore, it created a difficult situation for Native Americans in the United States, who were pulled into a conflict in which neither side cared about their rights or well-being. The book; *1812: The War that Forged a Nation* by Walter R. Borneman, that was published in 2004, also inspected how the War of 1812 gave the country a fresh sense of purpose and cleared the path towards westward development. The book chronicles the key events of the war from its inception to its conclusion at the Battle of New Orleans. Furthermore, the book concluded that the Americans behaved unethically throughout the war because, while American grievances against the British were genuine, the major reason the "war hawks" in America pushed for the war was to take Canada from the British and Florida from the Spanish. For its part. The book: *The War of 1812: A Forgotten Conflict* by Donald R. Hickey, published in 1989, went in great detail into the Conflict of 1812 and examined all elements of the war, including military, domestic, and diplomatic history. The bicentennial edition includes more information on how the war promoted American nationalism and manifest destiny, stimulated defense spending, and enhanced America's reputation abroad, as well as sparked conflicts between pro-war Republicans and anti-war Federalists, negatively affected American Indians, and solidified anti-British sentiments in the United States. Another book that discussed these events is, *The War of 1812: The War Both Sides Won* by Wesley B. turner, in his second edition published 1 000 provides a very informative background about the war participants' positions and conditions prior to the war, and it concludes how after peace, Indian people and leadership gave up the fight against westward expansion following Britain's withdrawal from their alliance. Furthermore, *The War of 1812* by David S. Heidler and Jeanne T. Heidler give an in-depth account to the event surrounding the war while paying attention to the impact of every aspect related to it.

Knowledge Gap:

This research is different from the previous works as it attempts to establish a cause-and-effect relationship between the outcomes of the 1812 war and the success of the post-war expansion era showing clearly how every war result encouraged white settlements west and boosted expansion of America in the process.

Purpose of Study:

The purpose of this study is to examine if the war of 1812 had an effect on expansion and if so, how did it pave the way to further expansion

Thesis Statement:

The war of 1812 had a great impact on the following expansion of the United States as a country. For this end the following questions were asked:

Research Questions:

- To what extent did the war effect expansion?
- What were the factors or the circumstances that the war created to push forward or encourage later expansion?
- How did the war outcomes effect expansion?

Approach:

A historical descriptive-analytical approach is adopted to carry out the current study, using data from books, articles, and websites.

This dissertation is composed of three chapters. The opening chapter tackle the origins of American expansion prior to the war of 1812. The second chapter will discuss the war itself and major causes behind it, while also shedding light on to the impactful events and battels of the war. The third chapter will investigate the effect of the war of 1812 later expansion of the United States.

Chapter One:

Introduction:

The USA has always been an expansionist state even before its independence, from the days of early settlers and the formation of the colonies later to become states. The following chapter will summaries the expansionist history of the country as well as the road leading to the start of the war of 1812, and the political climate of the nation at the time.

Early expansion:

Overview/background of American Expansion:

On December 20, 1606, the London Company sent out its first voyage to begin establishing Virginia, although it was far from the first European endeavor to exploit North America. For example, in 1564, French Protestants (Huguenots) established a colony in what is now Jacksonville, Florida. The Spanish, who had previously claimed the territory, was not amused by this encroachment. The Spanish erected a military base in St. Augustine the next year, and Spanish forces quickly drove out the French interlopers who lived only 40 miles away.

Meanwhile, Basque, English, and French fishing ships began to visit the coastlines from Newfoundland to Cape Cod on a regular basis. Some of these fishing fleets even established semi-permanent settlements along the beaches to dry their catches and trade with locals, swapping furs for manufactured items. Europeans' presence in North America was confined to these semi-permanent invasions over the following two decades. The English then attempted to establish a permanent colony on Roanoke Island (on the outer banks of present-day North Carolina) in the 1580s, but their efforts were short-lived.

In the early 1600s, the English established a colony (Jamestown) in the Chesapeake Bay in 1607, the French established Quebec in 1608, and the Dutch had an interest in the territory that became present-day, New York. Within a generation, the Plymouth Company (1620), the Massachusetts Bay Company (1629), the Company of New France (1627), and the Dutch West India Company (1621) began to transport thousands of immigrants to North America, including families. The success of colonization was not predetermined. Rather, interest in North America was the result of a halting, yet worldwide, competition among European powers to exploit these territories.

Another critical aspect to remember is: European colonization and settlement of North America

(and other parts of the so-called "new world") was an invasion of territory already held and populated by Native Americans for millennia. To be sure, Native American rule and colonization of that region appeared to Europeans to be distinct. Nonetheless, Native American communities saw the advent of Europeans as an incursion and attempted a variety of strategies to deal with it. The fact that the Native Americans were ultimately unsuccessful in opposing or creating a more advantageous arrangement with the Europeans was due to the impact of European illnesses as well as greater power of arms. Furthermore, comprehending the intricate interplay of two very distinct peoples requires viewing the issue through Native American eyes.

Finally, it is crucial to remember that the third group of people, in this instance Africans, actively participated in the European conquest (or colonization) of the Western Hemisphere. European attempts to create colonies in the Western Hemisphere failed from the start due to a shortage of laborers to perform the arduous job of colony-building. For example, the Spanish enslaved Native Americans in areas under their authority. To alleviate the labor crisis in Virginia, the English devised the concept of indentured servitude. Almost all European nations eventually turned to African slavery to provide labor on their West Indian islands. Slavery was later extended to other South and North American colonies.

Because of the interactions of these very different peoples, the process of European colonization of the Western Hemisphere was certainly difficult. Individual members of each group were frequently presented with events that were not of their own creation or choice. These people used the resources at their disposal to respond. These measures were insufficient for the majority of people to prevail. These people, however, were not passive bystanders; they were active agents attempting to create their fates. The fact that many of them failed should not diminish their efforts.

From 1606 to 1610, the English establish a foothold at Jamestown. The London Company set out from England on December 20, 1606, to establish a colony in Virginia. At April 1607, the would-be colonists arrived in Chesapeake Bay. There were 105 individuals on board, including 40 troops, 35 "gentlemen," and a variety of artists and workers.

The Development of the Virginia Colony, 1611-1624, Almost from the beginning, investors in the Virginia Company in England were dissatisfied with the achievements of their Jamestown colonists. As a result, they requested a new charter, which the king granted in May 1609. They immediately took

efforts to place the firm on a more solid financial foundation by selling shares worth 12 1/2, 25, and 50 pounds (English monetary unit, originally equivalent to one pound of silver). Investors were promised a payout from the Company's gold, land, or other precious commodities after seven years.

Meanwhile, the charter granted the Company the authority to create its own laws and regulations, subject only to their conformity with English law. To avoid the squabbles that had marked Virginia's early years, the Company granted the colony's governor unlimited authority and virtually dictatorial powers. These modifications were almost too little and too late, as Jamestown was in the midst of its "starving period." The Company, on the other hand, was steadfast in its resolve and dispatched the second batch of ships and colonists in 1611. Over the following five years, the colony was ruled with an iron hand by Sir Thomas Gates and later Sir Thomas Dale through the "Lawes Devine, Moral and Martial."

The harsh regimes of Virginia's governors proved unappealing to potential colonists. Furthermore, the colonists who did travel to Virginia frequently lacked the necessary skills and expertise to make the colony thrive. Not only did the colonists find nothing of value, but they were also unable to sustain themselves. As a result, many colonists died as a result of disease (many of which they carried with them), unclean surroundings, and hunger. Between 1614 and 1618, potential colonists were far more drawn to the West Indies and Bermuda than to Virginia.

By 1618, the Virginia Company had been compelled to shift direction once more. The Company had not addressed the issue of profitability or settler morale. Sir Edwin Sandys was appointed Company Treasurer and initiated several changes. He thought that the Company's industrial ventures were failing to owe to a lack of labor. He instituted a program of awarding sub-patents to land, which enticed organizations and wealthy individuals to visit Virginia. He wanted to reward investors, so he gave each explorer 100 acres of property. He also gave 50 acres to each individual who paid his or her own way, plus an extra 50 acres for each other person they brought along. This was referred to as the Virginia headright system.

Finally, Sandys believed that reforming the colony's governmental system was critical. He came up with the concept of holding an assembly in the colony, with delegates elected by the residents. The assembly will have complete authority over all things pertaining to the colony. Of course, the governor

or the Company in London may veto this legislation.

Some aspects may have improved, while others did not. The colony eventually identified a main product: tobacco. Thanks to John Rolfe's research. Even though the King was opposed to the usage of the weed, the colonists wanted to cultivate it since it was a cash crop. However, the Company consistently discouraged the growth of tobacco since its production diverted colonists' attention away from maize farming. The colony also continued to struggle with a lack of laborers and an inability to feed itself.

The ultimate solution to the labor problem was foreshadowed ominously in a little-noticed event described by Rolfe to Sandys in 1619: the arrival of a Dutch man-of-war carrying a group of captive Africans, for by the end of the century, African slave labor would become the colony's economic and social foundation. The Virginia Company was eventually brought to a stop by Indian relations, which appeared to be calm for a time. Indians rose up and murdered a significant number of Virginia colonists in 1622. This resulted in an investigation of the Company's operations and, eventually, the cancellation of its charter.

From 1732 until 1750, the Georgia Colony was established. England established the last of her colonies in North America in the 1730s. James Oglethorpe, a veteran army officer, devised the concept. After leaving the army, Oglethorpe committed himself to assisting the destitute and indebted citizens of London, to whom he recommended immigrating to America. Georgia, named after the new King, was also chosen as a defensive buffer for South Carolina, an increasingly important colony with numerous possible adversaries nearby. These adversaries included the Spanish in Florida, the French in Louisiana and along the Mississippi River, and the Indian allies of these nations across the region.

In June 1732, twenty trustees obtained funds from Parliament and a charter from the King. The trustees were given the rights of a corporation under the charter, including the ability to elect their own governing body, make land transfers, and pass their own laws and taxes. Because the company was a charity organization, none of the trustees could obtain land from it or take a paid job inside it. Furthermore, because the project was intended to help the poor, the trustees set a 500-acre restriction on the extent of individual property holdings. People who had received charity but had not acquired their own land were unable to sell or borrow against it. The trustees sought to prevent the scenario in

South Carolina, which had very vast plantations and significant economic disparities.

The project was fundamentally paternalistic. The trustees, for example, did not trust the colonists to create their laws. As a result, they did not form a representative assembly, even though every other mainland colony did. The trustees drafted all of the colony's laws. Second, the communities were planned out in townships that were compact, restricted, and focused. This structure was put in place in part to strengthen the colony's fortifications, but social control was also a factor. Third, the trustees forbade the importation and manufacturing of rum because it would cause laziness. Finally, the trustees outlawed Negro slavery, believing that such a prohibition would stimulate the settlement of "English and Christian" people.

Georgia's first year, 1733, started well enough, with people clearing land, building buildings, and fortifying the state. Those who arrived in the initial wave of settlement knew that they would be working for themselves after the first year. Meanwhile, Oglethorpe, who accompanied the first immigrants to Georgia, began negotiating treaties with local Indian groups, particularly the Upper Creek tribe. Knowing that the Spanish, stationed in Florida, wielded considerable power over many of the tribes in the region, Oglethorpe believed it was critical to strike an agreement with these local peoples if Georgia was to stay free of invasion. Furthermore, Indian commerce became an important part of Georgia's economy.

It didn't take long, however, for the settlers to complain about all the limitations imposed by the trustees. This grouching may have been exacerbated in part by the fact that the majority of individuals migrating to Georgia after the first few years were from neighboring colonies, particularly South Carolina. These settlers saw limits on the extent of individual landholdings as a guaranteed road to poverty. For the same reason, they opposed limitations on land transactions and the abolition of slavery. They certainly did not enjoy the fact that they were denied self-government and their Englishmen's rights. By the early 1740s, the trustees had gradually conceded on most of the colonists' concerns.

The British acquired enormous territory in North America during the Seven Years' War, but with the land came various issues of how to administer it, as seen by the 1763 Proclamation Line and Westward Expansion. Conflicts developed as a result of British authorities' incapacity to balance the interests of colonists and Indians, leading to colonial discontent with imperial rule and, eventually, to

the causes of the American Revolution.

The Treaty of Paris, which ended the Seven Years' War in 1763, gave the United Kingdom enormous territorial gains. The pact ceded control of Canada and the whole present-day United States east of the Mississippi to the British. With the conclusion of the war officially declared, Anglo-American colonists began to stream across the Appalachian Mountains in quest of land. Many of these settlers had no formal title to the property because the local people had made no land cessions. In many cases, the property was claimed by private land corporations in which the Virginia aristocracy had substantially invested in order to diversify their holdings away from the volatile tobacco industry. As a result, they had a vested interest in pressuring the British government to resolve the resulting tensions.

The colonization of regions west of the Appalachians inevitably resulted in friction and violence between settlers and indigenous peoples. Military authorities from the United Kingdom sought to stop colonization, but enthusiastic settlers and land speculators defied their orders. Because the military was hesitant to forcefully remove residents from the territories, Anglo-American colonists continued to march west and claim these lands.

In reaction to British efforts and western settlement, Pontiac, the chief of the Ottawa nation, sent signals encoded in wampum belts to other villages around the modern Midwest in order to organize an attack on British forts. Unaware of the extent of Indian hatred, British soldiers were caught off guard and lost all of their western forts save Fort Pitt and Detroit, where British military authorities were informed off and thereby prevented capture.

When news of the rebellion reached London, the government decided to put into action a plan for creating a western Indian reserve, and produced the Royal Proclamation of 1763, which forbid colonial settlement beyond the line of the Appalachian Mountains. The act also created the provinces of Quebec, West Florida, and East Florida. The proclamation was largely ineffective in preventing western settlement, and served only to anger both settlers and the political elite who had invested in western land speculation.

Tensions between settlers and Indians were a component of the American Revolution when it began in 1774. The Continental Congress' attempts to win Indian coalitions were mostly unsuccessful, because most Indians regarded the British troops as the lesser of two evils in their fight against settlers'

encroachment on their land. The Oneida and Tuscarora Nations of the Iroquois Confederacy, on the other hand, supported the colonists.

The result of British frontier policy was to unite frontiersmen, Virginia land speculators, and New Englanders in opposition to unpopular British policies. Dissatisfied with British taxation practices, some factions formed revolutionary coalitions with other colonies.

In 1783, officials from the United States and Great Britain gathered in Paris to formally terminate the American Revolutionary War and define the boundaries of the new republic. The Treaty of Paris awarded the United States title to an enormous amount of territory. From the thinly populated Atlantic Coast in the east to the Mississippi River in the west; from the Great Lakes in the north to near the Gulf of Mexico in the south, the nascent republic spanned. However, the United States was not alone on the continent; Britain, Spain, France, Mexico, and Russia all claimed or possessed land west of the Mississippi River and south to the Gulf of Mexico.

The borders created by the United States in Paris did not last long. Over the following seventy years, the United States extended to the Pacific Ocean, acquiring more than two million square miles of continuous territory via land acquisitions, treaties, and conflict.

When the United States acquired the Louisiana region from France in 1803 and financed Lewis and Clark's expedition (1805–1807), President Thomas Jefferson championed westward development. Jefferson's foreign policy aim of expanding US territory westward was meant to provide the US more latitude in dealing with foreign countries on the North American continent and to solidify the nascent republic's power. It necessitated the development of military might as well as astute diplomacy. 9 Jefferson's initiatives, notably those relating to US development in the current Gulf Coast region, were carried on by two more presidential administrations.

Following the acquisition of the Louisiana region, Jefferson and his successors concentrated on capturing Spanish Florida, which included all of modern-day Florida as well as a strip stretching down the Gulf Coast to the Mississippi River. One motivation was the creation of new opportunities for trade and ports along the Gulf Coast. Another consideration was national security: Florida provided strategic relevance in safeguarding Louisiana, the Mississippi Territory, and Georgia. President James Madison used the same strategies as his predecessor. From 1805 to 1810, US immigrants became the majority

population in West Florida, which stretched from Baton Rouge on the east bank of the Mississippi River in modern-day Louisiana to Pensacola in the panhandle of modern-day Florida. The settlers fought against the weakening of Spanish control and sought American sovereignty. The Mobile Act was approved by Congress in 1804 and extended U.S. federal tax laws to all areas surrendered by France, including West Florida.

1776: the continental congress declare independence as the United States of America:

The 13 American colonies broke their political ties to Great Britain by releasing the Declaration of Independence, which was adopted by the Continental Congress on July 4, 1776. The colonies' motives for pursuing independence were articulated in the Declaration. The American colonists were able to confirm an official alliance with the Government of France and secure French aid in the fight against Great Britain by proclaiming themselves an independent nation.

1783: the revolutionary war officially ends with the treaty of Paris:

On September 3, 1783, U.S. and British representatives signed the Treaty of Paris, thereby ending the American Revolutionary War. The pact, based on a preliminary treaty signed in 1782, acknowledged US independence and awarded the US substantial western land. The 1783 Treaty was one of several treaties signed in Paris in 1783 that secured peace between the United Kingdom and its allies, France, Spain, and the Netherlands.

1787: the constitution is adopted by the constitutional convention:

The Constitutional Convention, a hundred-day discussion, was one of the most significant events in the United States Constitutional History, and the events that took place in the Pennsylvania State House during that period would set the United States on the path to becoming the real Constitutional Republic.

The Constitutional Convention met in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, from May 14 to September 17, 1787. The purpose of the gathering was to decide how America would be governed. Even though the Convention was apparently assembled to modify the existing Articles of Confederation, several participants had far greater intentions. Men like James Madison and Alexander Hamilton preferred to establish a new government rather than repair the old one. George Washington was picked by the participants to preside over the Convention.

1789: George Washington became the first president of the U.S:

George Washington was overwhelmingly elected President of the United States in the first presidential election in 1789. Washington received the backing of every participating elector with 69 electoral votes. Since then, no president has taken office with a universal mandate to lead.

1791: the bill of rights is added to the constitution as the first 10 amendments:

The first 10 amendments were presented by Congress in its first session in 1789, and after being ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several states, they became a part of the Constitution on December 15, 1791, and are known as the Bill of Rights.

1803: the size of the US is nearly doubled by the Louisiana purchase from France:

The Louisiana Purchase has been dubbed "history's largest real estate transaction." The United States paid France \$15 million for the Louisiana Territory, which included 828,000 square miles of territory west of the Mississippi River, in 1803. The purchased territories extended from the Mississippi River to the Rocky Mountains, as well as from the Gulf of Mexico to the Canadian border. The Louisiana Territory was divided into thirteen states. The Louisiana Purchase almost quadrupled the size of the United States, transforming it into one of the world's largest nations.

1804: explorers Lewis and Clark set out on their journey to the Pacific Ocean:

Meriwether Lewis and William Clark embarked on a two-year trip to record the recently acquired Louisiana Territory in 1804. They gathered information on plant life, animals, and some of the Native American tribes that lived in the area on their route until they reached the Pacific Ocean.

The road to war:

1812: the war of 1812 began against Great Britain:

June 18, 1812: The day after the Senate together with the House of Representatives declared war on the United Kingdom, President James Madison signed the declaration into law, launching the War of 1812. The American war declaration, which was rejected by a significant minority in Congress, was called in reaction to the British economic blockade of France, the forced recruitment of American sailors into the British Royal Navy, and the British backing of Indian tribes along the Great Lakes boundary.

For several years, a party of Congress known as the "War Hawks" had advocated war with Britain, and they had not concealed their expectations that a US invasion of Canada would result in major territorial territory gains for the US.

Mentality of American Population Towards the War of 1812:

When the United States declared war on Britain in June 1812, the vote in Congress on the declaration of war was the closest vote on any official declaration of war in the country's history. Only 81 percent of Republicans in both chambers supported the war, while no Federalists did. The tight result demonstrates the war's unpopularity among significant sectors of the American population.

Riots erupted throughout the east, notably in Baltimore and New York City, in response to the War of 1812. The grounds for the resistance stemmed mostly from the country's inexperience in global affairs, as well as the war's unclear and vague motivations.

Dominant Political Parties Views Towards the War of 1812:

The rift between supporters and opponents mirrored the split between the two political parties at the time, the Democratic-Republicans and the Federalists. These two opposing political parties were the nation's initial opponent parties since its inception. Under Alexander Hamilton, the Federalists developed with a desire for an industrial and international trade-based economy, whilst Republicans preferred an agrarian economy with little interaction with outsiders. Former President Thomas Jefferson (who signed the Embargo Act of 1807) and President James Madison, who was clamoring for war at the time, were both Republicans.

Republicans:

Some Americans regarded expansion into Canada as defining their country's legitimacy. At the time, War Hawks were strong supporters of expansionism, believing that British actions were a danger to free commerce and just rude. Hawk of War Henry Clay was elected Speaker of the House, and he was determined to protect America's image and interests by driving Spain out of Florida and England out of Canada. As a result, the South and West backed the war because they needed more territory for cultivation and plantations. Newer western states, like Kentucky, Tennessee, and Ohio, supported the war to "eradicate the Indian threat."

The Role of Newspapers:

Northeastern newspapers frequently criticized Madison as dishonest and venal, especially when the John Henry (1776–1853) affair emerged in March 1812, when it was revealed that Madison had paid the British spy \$50,000 for information against the Federalists that could never be verified. Furthermore, there was a strong suspicion among the Federalists that Madison and his political friends intended to go to war with Britain in order to move the United States closer to Napoleon Bonaparte's France.

Newspapers on the other side of the debate said that the Federalists were an "English party" in the United States seeking to split the country and restore it to British authority. The summer of 1812 was dominated by debate over the war, even after it had been declared. Daniel Webster (1782–1852), a young New England attorney, delivered an oration at a public Fourth of July celebration in New Hampshire that was rapidly printed and disseminated.

Webster, who had not yet campaigned for office, condemned the war but made a legal point: "It is now the law of the nation, and as such we are obligated to accept it."

Other state governments passed resolutions supporting one of the parties. And it is obvious that, despite a huge division in the country, the United States went to war in the summer of 1812.

Federalists:

The federalist party represented the opposition party to the war; though there were sympathizers, the War of 1812 was also met with strong criticism. With a vote of 78 to 49 in the House and 19 to 13 in the Senate, it was the narrowest margin of favor for a declaration of war ever. New England was vehemently opposed because, while the concerns of impressment were directly impacting this region of the country, they felt that war would jeopardize the already precarious commerce. Many people were put off by previous presidential actions such as the Embargo and Non-Intercourse Acts, which harmed the commerce sector.

Federalists, who mostly populated the North, voted unanimously against the war, and their resistance persisted even after the war was proclaimed. The Baltimore riots were noteworthy in terms

of demonstrating political tensions. Early in 1812, in Baltimore, violence was directed against the offices of the Federal Republican, an anti-war Federalist journal, and the editors were tortured when they attempted to return (one death resulted). This continuous resistance would eventually contribute to the Federalist Party's demise after the war.

State Government Opposition:

Governments were concerned that the United States was not militarily equipped for a full-fledged conflict. The army was understaffed, and governments were concerned that their state militias might be deployed to supplement the regular soldiers. The governors of Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts declined to cooperate with the federal call for militiamen when the war began. They contended that the president of the United States could only requisition state militia to protect the country in the case of an invasion and that no such invasion was imminent.

New Jersey's state legislature condemned the declaration of war, calling it "inconvenient, ill-timed, and most dangerously impolitic, surrendering at once innumerable blessings." The Pennsylvania assembly adopted the opposite route, passing a resolution denouncing the New England governors who were opposed to the war effort.

Unclear Motives for War:

According to the proclamation, the apparent motives of the conflict were that the British were restricting foreign trade and impressment of sailors. During the first decade of the nineteenth century, the British government was battling Napoleon Bonaparte's (1769–1821) invasions, and to boost their resources, they confiscated cargoes and impressed nearly 6,000 seamen from American commercial ships.

Political efforts to address the problem were thwarted, owing in part to incompetent envoys and failed embargo measures. By 1812, then-President James Madison (served 1810–1814) and his Republican Party had concluded that only war could solve the problem. Some Republicans viewed the conflict as a second War of Independence against the British, while others believed that fighting an unpopular war would result in a Federalist surge. The war was unfair and immoral in the eyes of the Federalists, who advocated for peace, neutrality, and free commerce.

Riots in Baltimore:

Hanson returned to Baltimore a month later, on July 26, 1812, with a party of supporters that included two prominent Revolutionary War veterans, James Langan (1751–1812) and General Henry "Light-Horse Harry" Lee (1756–1818 and the father of Robert E. Lee). Hanson and his partners relocated to the city and into a brick home. The guys were armed, and they effectively barricaded the home in preparation for another violent mob approach.

A gang of youths gathered outside the home, yelling insults and hurling stones. To disperse the increasing crowd outside, guns, probably loaded with blank cartridges, were fired from an upper level of the home. The stone flinging got more ferocious, and the house's windows were smashed.

The guys in the home began firing live fire, injuring many persons on the street. A musket round killed a local doctor. The rabble was whipped up into a frenzy. When the authorities arrived on the scene, they negotiated the surrender of the guys in the house. Approximately 20 men were brought to the local jail, where they were held for their safety.

Opposition in Baltimore:

At the start of the conflict, popular opinion in Baltimore, a flourishing seaport, favored the declaration of war. In reality, privateers from Baltimore were already sailing sail in the summer of 1812 to assault British trade, and the city would subsequently become the target of a British onslaught two years later.

On June 20, 1812, two days after war was declared, the "Federal Republican," a Baltimore newspaper, issued a scathing editorial condemning the war and the Madison government. Many residents were outraged by the story, and two days later, on June 22, a crowd went on the newspaper's office and destroyed its printing press.

Alexander C. Hanson (1786–1819), publisher of the Federal Republican, escaped to Rockville, Maryland. But Hanson was adamant about returning and continuing to criticize the federal administration.

Lynch Mob:

On the night of July 28, 1812, a mob gathered outside the jail, pushed its way inside, and assaulted

the inmates. The majority of the guys were brutally beaten, and Langan was murdered by being smashed in the head with a hammer, according to reports.

General Lee was brutally assaulted, and his injuries most likely contributed to his death some years later. Hanson, the Federal Republican's publisher, survived but was brutally battered. John Thomson, one of Hanson's companions, was assaulted by the crowd, carried through the streets, and tarred and feathered, but escaped by faking death.

American newspapers published gruesome tales of the Baltimore violence. People were particularly disturbed by the assassination of James Lingam, a friend of George Washington who had been wounded while fighting as an officer in the Revolutionary War.

Temperaments in Baltimore calmed after the incident. Alexander Hanson relocated to Georgetown, on the outskirts of Washington, D.C., where he continued to produce a newspaper criticizing the war and the government.

In the end, the embargoes harmed eastern enterprises more than European firms—while Republicans in the west saw the war as a chance to take Canada or parts of it.

Conclusion:

The preceding chapter delved into the expansionist spirit of the USA, how it started, and how the developing events unpreventably lead to a war of dominance in the north American subcontinent. The young American nation had a need to affirm its independence and saw a chance to do so during the Napoleonic war. The chapter also briefly discusses the public and political climate preceding and at the immediate start of the war. The war had opponents and proponents both in the representative bodies, as well as, in the population of the countries, with opposition even turning violent and becoming riots.

Chapter Two

Introduction:

The War of 1812 was undoubtedly a unique conflict but due to not having a clear victor it's mostly called 'the forgotten war' nevertheless, the war did happen for some reasons, this chapter will give a background on The War of 1812, next it will list the major reasons behind it both official and unofficial and finally this chapter will show how the war progressed while highlighting its most important events.

Background of The 1812 War:

Between 1802 and 1812, Napoleon used military conquest and alliances to build a sprawling empire in Europe. His ability to extend his power beyond the continent, however, came to an end in 1805, when Admiral Nelson destroyed the French fleet at the Battle of Trafalgar. From then on, the Royal Navy stood between Napoleon and invasions from the other side of the Channel. He couldn't attack Britain's fortress, and he couldn't prevent the British from sending armies to aid his enemies on the continent. As a result, Napoleon resorted to economic warfare, the only remaining weapon with which he could hope to defeat the "nation of shopkeepers." In November 1806 Napoleon ordered the closure of all European ports under his control to British ships. Later, he declared that neutral ships that visit a British port before entering a continental port would be impounded. Britain responded by issuing a series of The Orders in Council. Before sailing to Europe, all neutral ships had to enter British ports and obtain a license. Neutrals were required to obey French or British orders. What option does a ship's captain have? Britain had the sea power to enforce its blockade and compel neutral ships to follow its rules. The United States was the most important neutral nation trading with Europe. British interference with American ships would contribute to the outbreak of the War of 1812.

Britain's North American colonies stretched from the Atlantic Ocean to the western end of Lake Erie and the shores of Lake Huron on the eve of the war. Their populations were steadily but slowly increasing. Lower Canada (later Quebec province) had about 270,000 people; New Brunswick and Nova Scotia had about 80,000, and Upper Canada (Ontario) had estimates ranging from 60,000 to 80,000.

The smaller populations of Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island, and Cape Breton brought the total to well over 500,000. The inhabitants were dispersed, mostly on farms, so numbers tell only part of the story. Towns were small, and industries were scarce. These colonies had few weapons with which to wage war.

When war loomed, it became clear that Upper Canada was the most vulnerable of the colonies. The most difficult issue was transportation. Roads were few, and those that did exist were dreadful: deeply rutted sticky mud in the spring thaw and whenever it rained. Even in dry weather, potholes, tree stumps, and unbridged rivers irritated and delayed travelers. When war loomed, Upper Canada quickly became the most vulnerable of the colonies. Transportation was the most difficult issue. Roads were scarce, and those that did exist were deplorable: deeply rutted sticky mud in the spring thaw and whenever it rained. Even in dry weather, holes in the road, tree stumps, and unbridged rivers irritated and delayed travelers. It took several days to complete the journey. West of Kingston, travel was easier and faster because ships could sail to York (now Toronto) and Newark (Niagara-on-the-Lake). To go any further, another portage from Queenston up the Niagara River along the Portage Road to Chippewa was required. Sailing ships could then transport people and goods to the few small settlements that dot the shores of Lake Erie.

Upper Canada was incapable of defending itself. Its small population was dispersed over a 1,300-kilometer stretch from Cornwall on St. Lawrence to Amherstburg on Lake Erie. People did not cultivate all of their food, nor did they produce all of their own things. They could not provide an army or even support British soldiers with their own resources. Britain's assistance in the shape of soldiers, money, supplies, and ships was critical.

All of these military requirements were contingent on a path that the Americans might readily sever. They simply needed to march an army north and barricade St. Lawrence south of Montreal, and Upper Canada would be theirs without having to battle. The British administration, as well as Canadian authorities, were constantly concerned about the safety of the road from Montreal to Amherstburg.

With a fast-increasing population of over 7.5 million, the United States was stronger than Canada. Settlers were pouring into New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio, encroaching on the Canadian border. Pioneer settlements like Buffalo, Black Rock, and Lewiston were still small along the Niagara River, but highways connected them to more populous regions to the east and south. Rich farmland and growing cities with industry were not far away.

The American people could supply thousands of warriors, and farms and manufacturing could meet the majority of their requirements. American supply routes were inland, out of sight of British soldiers. Roads were scarcer further west in Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Michigan Territory; thus, movement was primarily by river or through woodland routes. These approaches were not only more challenging, but they were also more exposed to an unexpected Indian invasion.

Main causes of the war:

Official reasons:

Impressment of American sailors:

In addition to the obnoxious Orders in Council, the British revived their traditional policy of impressment to supply sailors to the Royal Navy with vigor. Impressment was a crude form of conscription. Throughout the modern era, all naval powers have used it at some point. However, by the early nineteenth century, Americans were not the only ones who found the practice repugnant, and even the British government saw the need to limit the more provocative practices of the tradition. Only British subjects on British territory, in British harbors, or on commercial ships at sea were subject to impressment. However, many American citizens, who were virtually indistinguishable from British subjects in both appearance and speech, fell victim to the policy. Estimates vary, but it is likely that between 1808 and 1811, approximately 6,000 American citizens were enlisted in the Royal Navy. 1 When confronted with such data, the British claimed that they were simply reclaiming deserters who had abandoned king and country.

Many deserters took work aboard American ships, and the US government attempted to safeguard them by granting them certificates of American citizenship. However, according to British naval officers, these soldiers had breached the law by deserting and could lawfully be returned to a British ship. Captains occasionally behaved rashly, even enlisting native-born American citizens to serve aboard British ships.

The Chesapeake Incident and the Restrictive System:

Efforts by the United States to reach a diplomatic solution to the problem of neutral rights failed due to the issue of impressment, and a serious incident in 1807 nearly threw the two countries into war. When the British frigate HMS Leopard intercepted the US naval frigate Chesapeake off the

coast of Virginia with the intention of capturing four "deserters," three Americans were killed and eighteen others were injured by three British broadsides. The United States erupted in a unified cry for vengeance and vindication, and President Thomas Jefferson could have easily obtained a congressional declaration of war. Nonetheless, it was the president's lone and lonely voice for peace that was heard.

Jefferson's prudence was dictated by circumstance as much as by principle. Economies enacted during Jefferson's first term had rendered the American navy and army ineffective. Jefferson, forced to seek an alternative to war, devised a strategy to capitalize on war-torn Europe's reliance on the United States for resources and food. The president believed that if the United States refused to export goods to Europe, Britain and France would be forced to reopen trade on American terms, particularly those that respected neutral rights. Jefferson persuaded Congress to pass the Embargo Act late in 1807, using his considerable persuasion and power. The law forbade exports from the United States on both domestic and foreign carriers. However, the embargo only harmed US commerce. Americans became increasingly defiant of the law, and the government's harsh enforcement measures made the embargo even more heinous. Anger in New England reached a boiling point, endangering not only government agents but also the Union itself. The embargo was repealed by Congress on March 1, 1809, three days before Jefferson handed over the presidency to his successor, James Madison. The Non-Intercourse Act was quickly passed by Congress, reopening trade with everyone except England and France. Until 1812, when diplomacy gave way to war, such a course of action was the main thrust of American foreign policy in one form or another.

The British support of Indians to slow American expansion

Since the 1780s, Indians had been fighting the expansion of American colonization in the Old Northwest (south of Lake Erie, north of the Ohio River). Despite this, thousands more Americans came into the area each year, increasing Ohio's population to over 230,000 and Kentucky's to about 400,000 by 1810. These Europeans desired to drive away from the Indians so that they could farm the land.

The Prophet (Tenskwatawa), a Shawnee leader, realized that division among the tribes was his people's main vulnerability. Beginning in 1805, he attempted to create a confederacy of all Indian tribes in regions threatened by American colonization. After 1808, his older brother, war Chief Tecumseh, rose to prominence and has usually been credited with coordinating Indian

resistance to the Americans.

A tribe might be forced to cede its lands or persuaded into giving them away on its own. Between 1803 and 1809, Indiana Territory Governor William Henry Harrison did this several times with Indians south and west of Lake Erie. There were instances when two tribes claimed the same territories and there was war between them. Tecumseh and the Prophet maintained that only by banding together could the Indians settle their differences and be powerful enough to withstand American aggression. They advised Indians to depend on their own skills to build a strong Indian country rather than following in the footsteps of the white man. But, until such a state could be formed, they needed friends and turned to the British in Canada for assistance. Many Indians had sided with the British during the American Revolution, and in the aftermath of the conflict, some Iroquois, Miamis, Shawnees, and other tribes attempted to form Indian state south and west of Lake Erie. Indians would have authority over their own lives and land in such a state. American settlers would not be free to come and go as they pleased.

The British administration backed the notion of establishing an Indian state because it would act as a barrier for Upper Canada. While few British immigrants arrived in the province, a large number of Americans did. The government worried that if more people came in, they might exert enough pressure on the American authorities to try to conquer Upper Canada. This threat would be much reduced if there was Indian-held land along the Canadian border.

Every year, Indians flocked to Amherstburg, Fort St. Joseph, and other British outposts to collect gifts from the British government, which were provided through the Indian Department. Officers or agents from this department met Indians at posts, visited their villages, and sometimes married Indian women. As a result, these men learned to comprehend Indians and their emotions. Their skills were extremely valuable to the British since they visited Indian councils to listen and provide advice.

Many Indians, notably Tecumseh and the Prophet, were dissatisfied with their reliance on the British, believing it damaged Indian culture and self-respect. Most, however, were unable to refuse the gifts they were given since they had no other method of obtaining these things, particularly the weaponry they required to protect their country against the Americans. As a result, when war broke out, Tecumseh and his supporters, including Wyandot chiefs Roundhead and Split Log, believed they had no choice but to back the British. These Indians fought for their life, not to keep British control of Canada.

Americans saw British assistance for Indians as a danger to their government's aim of forcing Indians to give up their hunting areas and become farmers like American settlers. They thought that the British were inciting the Indians to fight and equipping them with weapons to do so, putting hundreds of American lives in jeopardy. On the contrary, the British maintained that they were attempting to prevent Indians from assaulting American settlers. Although most Americans would never accept it, it was real. The British did not want an Indian war because they knew it would increase the chances of conflict between Britain and the United States. Nonetheless, they could not stop all supplies to the Indians, for this would completely end their influence over them.

Concerned by Tecumseh's efforts to unify the tribes, the Americans intensified their pressure on Indian territories dramatically in 1811. Governor Harrison marched an army into Indian Territory at Prophetstown on the Tippecanoe River while Tecumseh was gone in the south seeking Indian help for the Confederacy. He intended to drive the Indians out of this town since it was the epicenter of the Prophet's influence. On November 7, at daybreak, the Prophet launched an attack on American forces. The Indians were beaten after many hours of fierce combat, and the Americans burned the village and its food supply. Instead of ending the conflict, the fall of Prophetstown prompted additional Indian raids, although Indian resistance remained weakened by tribal disunity.

Americans in the West continued to think that British interaction with Indians was fueling the violent frontier violence that murdered settlers' families and ruined their crops. Many saw this as justification enough to declare war on Britain. The Indians would have no friends to assist them to protect their homeland after the British were pushed out of Canada. Furthermore, American colonization in Upper Canada could proceed unhindered and fearlessly.

This viewpoint has been dubbed the war's land expansionist motive. It was most pronounced in the South and West, especially in Ohio, Tennessee, and Kentucky. Many persons with this viewpoint gained seats in the United States Congress in the 1810 election. They were dubbed "War Hawks" because they advocated war against Britain and were led by Kentucky's Henry Clay.

The Indian threat to white settlers on the western frontier was real, but Americans mistook the British for the source of that threat. Despite their commitment to maritime rights, War Hawks listened to western voices calling for the abolition of the Indian threat. By implication, eliminating

the British presence in Canada would be the most effective way to achieve that goal. Furthermore, acquiring Canada would satisfy America's expansionist ambitions. The country's southern frontier, which was bordered by Spanish Florida, drew expansionists as well, who were able to point to an Indian threat in their region and persuade themselves that the perpetrators of that threat were agitators from Europe

The British blockade of American trade:

The United States had been the world's primary neutral shipper since 1793, when Europe first went to war with revolutionary France. The resumption of the war in 1803 improved America's commercial position and significantly increased her trade. However, this favorable situation was only temporary. A stunning British victory at sea and an equally dramatic French victory on land resulted in a perplexing stalemate in 1805. The British fleet could not attack the French army any more than French soldiers could attack the Royal Navy's ships. As a result, the adversaries resorted to commercial warfare through a series of retaliatory measures. The British issued Orders in Council prohibiting foreign shipping from entering European ports under French control, and the French emperor issued a series of decrees blockading Britain and threatening to seize any ships that obeyed the Orders in Council.

This new and unpleasant development in the European war had a significant impact on American shipping interests while also afflicting American pride. Despite the fact that American trade enjoyed significant profits while operating under the perils of these commercial restrictions only the brave would face such risks, and they were duly rewarded, spiraling insurance rates and constrained markets took their toll.

The Orders in Council:

The United Kingdom also began imposing commercial restrictions on neutrals, claiming that Napoleon's strategy required retaliation. However, London believed that Britain's control of the seas would give her a commercial as well as a strategic advantage. Even in the absence of Napoleon's Berlin Decree, it is likely that the Tory government would have pursued a policy similar to the one it did. Napoleon's actions, as it happened, provided Britain with a convenient justification for her own disregard for international law.

The British system of controlling neutral trade with the enemy consisted of only one part that was a valid object of war: preventing Napoleon from using contraband in military actions.

Otherwise, the Orders in Council were designed to reduce the competition of neutral carriers, allowing British shippers to take over their routes and increase British profits. Simultaneously, London would allow neutral shipping to break the French blockade of European ports. The London government announced this complex scheme in a 7 January 1807 Order in Council, claiming it was in response to the Berlin Decree. The order clearly violated even the Rule of 1756 by prohibiting neutral trade between all enemy ports, including those in Europe, because such trade had existed during peacetime. Despite the fact that this broad declaration significantly tightened the terms of commercial restriction, Britain had reason to reassess the policy after only a few months because it was not working. On 11 November 1807, the British government issued another set of Orders in Council, refining the January version to impose strict blockade on all enemy countries, their colonies, and anywhere else that did not fly the British flag.

Under the November order, Britain could levy tariffs on American cargoes and charge American ships for licenses, gaining control while stealing American maritime profits. The policy was such a “momentous stride of encroachment,” in the words of John Quincy Adams that it is no surprise that it led to war. It's only surprising that it took so long.

The Berlin Decree

Issued by France in 1806, formally declared a blockade of the United Kingdom. Any goods produced in England or its colonies, regardless of who owned them, would be considered a fair prize of war. Finally, according to the Berlin Decree, "No vessel coming directly from England, or any of its colonies, or having touched there since the publication of the present decree, shall be received into any harbor."

The Milan Decree:

Napoleon angrily announced the Milan Decree on 17 December 1807, only a month after the November Orders in Council. By then, he'd capped a spectacular string of military victories with an equally unexpected diplomatic triumph. He not only coerced Russia's Tsar Alexander I into accepting a dictated peace, but he also appears to have mesmerized the tsar into becoming a willing member of the Continental System. The Milan Decree reflected Napoleon's towering dominion, which he now

wielded from the Atlantic coast to the Caucasus peaks. He declared that all vessels of any nation that submitted to the Orders in Council were thus denationalized and devoid of any security afforded by their country's flag. They would be considered British property and subject to seizure in port and at sea. Assuming a righteous indignation, Napoleon declared that his decrees would remain in effect until the United Kingdom reversed her illegal policies.

The Royal Navy, as we've seen, was preventing neutral ships from accessing ports under Napoleon's authority. Because the majority of these ships were from the United States, many Americans felt that the British were merely interfering with their lucrative commerce. Worse, in their opinion, was the Royal Navy's habit of halting neutral ships at sea to hunt for contraband (goods deemed illegal for commerce with Europe by the British)

This arrogant British action, in the eyes of Americans, not only damaged their country's trade but also violated American law and authority. Many people thought that their country's dignity was being harmed and that war was the only way to force Britain to respect American sovereignty. The War of 1812 has been referred to as the United States' "second war of independence." Some believed that the new nation needed to go to war to show its independence. Virginia's John Clopton wrote:

The outrages in impressing American seamen exceed all manner of description. Indeed, the whole system of aggression now is such that the real question between Great Britain and the United States has ceased to be a question merely relating to certain rights of commerce . . . it is now clearly, positively, and directly a question of independence, that is to say, whether the United States are really an independent nation.

Unofficial reasons:

The war Hawks:

When the Twelfth Congress met in late 1811, its membership reflected a growing dissatisfaction with the world's perplexing situation. A group of young firebrands known as the War Hawks quickly took control of the House of Representatives. They were mostly from the South and West, and one of them easily won the speakership. Henry Clay of Kentucky was only thirty-four years old when he became a master politician and parliamentarian without peer. His leadership from the speaker's chair would shape

that post along its modern contours, making Clay, in contrast to the reserved Madison, the most powerful man in Washington at this critical juncture.

Clay claimed that, while both France and Britain had caused harm to the United States, Britain was the more serious offender. The United Kingdom's tightening rules on neutral trade irritated American merchants, and the British policy of impressment was particularly vexing. Clay reasoned that an attack on the British colony would force Britain to make concessions on both issues because Canada was so vulnerable. At the same time, conquest of Canada would eliminate a long-standing threat to America's security on the North American continent while also restoring national honor.

Clay, an intelligent politician, ensured that the War Hawks were well represented on key congressional committees. The Foreign Relations Committee had five War Hawks on it, including John C. Calhoun, and War Hawks chaired the Naval, Ways and Means, and Military Affairs Committees.

While the War Hawks were outspoken supporters of war, they were also committed to fighting it on the cheap. The War Hawks' march to war had a tentative quality to it because of their tight purse strings. For example, Kentucky's Samuel McKee strongly supported a ground invasion of Canada but voted against building new frigates because they were too expensive. Another War Hawk, Maryland's William Wright, voted repeatedly against raising taxes to fund the war.

The war vote was ultimately decided along strictly partisan lines. The House voted 79 to 49, while the Senate voted 19 to 13. All 98 Republicans who voted in favor of the war were Republicans. There was not a single Federalist who voted in favor. A small group of Republican firebrands had managed to persuade enough of their fellow party members to vote in favor of war with Great Britain, but the decision to go to war remained divisive even as the fighting raged.

The desire to annex Canada:

There is little doubt that territorial expansionism was a powerful factor throughout this period. Republican leaders fought tirelessly to free Louisiana and Florida from European control, and both the government and frontiersmen forced Indians off their territories with callous disdain for human rights. ⁴ Many Americans want Canada as well, if only to eliminate British dominance over American Indians. However, the ambition to invade Canada did not precipitate the conflict. It was more about marine problems, namely Orders-in-Council and impressment. "Canada was not the end but the means," said Henry Clay, "the object of the War being the redress of injuries, and Canada being the instrument by which that redress was to be obtained."

Because of its comparative inferiority to the United States, most Republicans saw Canada as an obvious target. Without including Indians, there were around 7.7 million people in the United States in 1812, compared to barely 500,000 in Canada. 6 The US also had over 12,000 regulars in uniform, but the British could only assemble 10,000 in Canada, and only 8,000 in the two provinces where the combat was most likely to occur: Upper Canada (modern-day Ontario) and Lower Canada (modern-day Quebec). 7 Additional enlistments, short-term volunteers, and militia drafts were expected to shift the balance even more in America's favor, especially since the United Kingdom couldn't afford to devote resources away from the war effort in Europe

Republicans also believed they had an advantage. Lower Canada, north of the St. Lawrence River, had two-thirds of its population of French ancestry and hence questionable loyalties, with many of the remainder being recent American immigrants. People's loyalty in Upper Canada, north of the Great Lakes, was similarly difficult because the majority of the population was American by birth. Although some were Loyalists who escaped north during or after the Revolution, there was a continuous flow of new immigrants from south of the border after 1792, eager to take advantage of free land and low taxes. By 1812, these immigrants, optimistically dubbed "Late Loyalists," represented 60% of the province's population. 8 Loyalists were adamantly opposed to British authority and had protested against it in 1811 "the sudden and indiscriminate influx of foreigners, sometimes openly, and at other times secretly hostile to the British Government,". But their complaint had made no effect. Despite the administration's request, the Upper Canadian assembly declined to force those serving in the militia to renounce foreign allegiance. By the time the war began, Major General Isaac Brock, the civilian head and military leader in Upper Canada, declared that the majority of his province's inhabitants were "essentially bad." They were "either indifferent to what is passing, or so completely American as to rejoice in the prospects of a change of Governments."

Republicans expected this disaffection to aid in their takeover of Canada. The idea that American forces would be welcomed in Canada was one of the reasons they went to war without proper preparedness. New York Governor Daniel D. Tompkins predicted that "one-half of the Militia of [Canada] would join our standard," and many Republicans shared this view. Jefferson claimed that "the acquisition of Canada this year, as far as the neighborhood of Quebec, will be a mere matter of marching," and Clay boasted that "the militia of Kentucky are alone competent to place Montreal and Upper Canada at our feet." In other words, most Republicans anticipated what John Randolph referred to as a "Holiday campaign." "With no expense of blood or treasure on our part, Canada is to conquer herself—she is to be subdued by the principles of fraternity."

The Federalists didn't deny that Canada could be captured, but they vehemently rejected that it was a viable objective. They believed that a war against Canada would be unfair, therefore they chose to settle American disputes with Great Britain on the high seas. "Canada has issued no Orders in Council," stated Massachusetts Congressman Samuel Taggart. "She has not impressed our seamen, taken our ships, confiscated our property, nor in any other respect treated us ill. All the crime alleged against Canada or the Canadians, is that, without any act of their own, they are connected with, and under the protection of a nation which has injured us on the ocean."

The invasion of Canada was viewed as not only unfair but also foolish by the Federalists. They had publicly opposed expansion since the Louisiana Purchase, fearing that any new territory would only strengthen Republican dominance while undermining national stability. The Maryland House of Delegates said that acquiring Canada would be "worse than a doubtful boon." It would "enfeeble" the United States, according to a Massachusetts Federalist, by increasing the country's "jarring materials." "The strength of the nation," a Delaware lawmaker said, "is already too much scattered."

Annexationist Fever

Because Republicans never said what they intended to do with the region once it was taken, federalists thought that Canada would be annexed. Because Canada was not an objective in itself, it was probably held for ransom on maritime problems, but what if Canada was captured and the British still refused to make concessions? The government has stayed mute on the subject, most likely to leave its options open. Even as late as 1814, North Carolina Federalist Joseph Pearson maintained that Republican leaders had never defined their position. "Do they mean to plant their standard on the walls of Quebec, apportion out the lands to the conquerors, and sing a requiem to 'free trade and sailors' rights'? These questions never have been satisfactorily answered." Some Republicans were open about their wish to maintain Canada, and this feeling got stronger as the conflict continued. "It appears to be the universal opinion of the Republicans," the Boston Chronicle reported in 1813, "that the Canadas ought in no event to be surrendered. . . . Too much valuable blood has already been shed, and too much treasure expended, to permit us to indulge for a moment the idea of resigning this country." Any deal that does not protect Canada, according to a Georgia senator, "would be extremely ungraciously received. "Annexationist fever was especially high in the West, where toasts to the acquisition of Canada were drunk and a resolution on the topic was proposed in the Kentucky legislature. By 1814, the word from the West, according to one commentator, "was unequivocal—Canada must not, shall not be given up." Long before this, Monroe had privately admitted that public sentiment may make it "difficult to relinquish Territory which had been conquered." Meanwhile,

the government had to figure out how to manage occupied territory. At the start of the war, Congress examined plans to create provisional administration in Canada and to protect Canadians' rights, but these measures were defeated in the Senate. As a result, the administration was left to fend for itself.

The War Department authorized its field commanders to pledge nothing more than security for Canadians' people, property, and rights. However, some cops went much further. Brigadier General William Hull issued a proclamation to Canadians on the Detroit border that stated, " You will be emancipated from tyranny and oppression, and restored to the dignified station of freemen." Similarly, Brigadier General Alexander Smyth proclaimed to his soldiers on the Niagara border that " the time is at hand when you will cross the streams of Niagara to conquer . . . a country that is to be one of the United States." The War Department supported Hull's declaration and, while it chastised Smyth, it did so discreetly. The administration's refusal to rescind either declaration made it much more difficult to reconcile domestic opponents of the war.

The progress of the 1812 war:

Neither the British in Canada nor the Americans were ready for war. In 1812, Americans were overly optimistic. The United States Secretary of War, William Eustis, stated, "We can take the Canadas without soldiers, we have only to send officers into the province and the people...will rally round our standard." Henry Clay said that "the militia of Kentucky are alone competent to place Montreal and Upper Canada at your feet." And Thomas Jefferson famously wrote:

The acquisition of Canada this year, as far as the neighborhood of Quebec, will be a mere matter of marching, and will give us experience for the attack of Halifax the next, and the final expulsion of England from the American continent.

Preoccupied with the European conflict, the British government saw American hostilities as a bothersome distraction, resulting in a scarcity of resources in men, supplies, and naval presence until late in the event. The only consolation for the British in Canada as they conducted operations in the shadow of scarcity was an American military malaise. Michigan territorial governor William Hull led US forces into Canada from Detroit, but Isaac Brock and Tecumseh's warriors chased Hull back across the border, scaring him into surrendering Detroit on August 16, 1812, without firing a shot—behavior that Americans and even Brock's officers found disgraceful. Following that, the Northwest was subjected to Indian raids and British

incursions led by Maj. Gen. Henry Procter. William Henry Harrison, Hull's replacement, could only defend a few scattered outposts. On the northeastern border, U.S. Brig. Gen. Henry Dearborn was unable to launch an attack on Montreal due to uncooperative New England militias. On October 13, 1812, U.S. forces led by Stephen van Rensselaer crossed the Niagara River to attack Queenston, but were defeated by a tenacious British defense led by Brock, who was killed during the battle. The subsequent invasion attempts on the Niagara by U.S. Gen. Alexander Smyth were a flop.

Madison replaced Dearborn in 1813 with Maj. Gens. James Wilkinson and Wade Hampton, an awkward arrangement exacerbated by a complicated invasion plan against Montreal. Both generals refused to coordinate their efforts, and neither came close to reaching Montreal. To the west, American Oliver Hazard Perry's Lake Erie squadron defeated Capt. Robert Barclay on September 10, 1813, off Put-In-Bay. The victory allowed Harrison to retake Detroit and defeat Procter's British and Indian forces at the Battle of the Thames. Tecumseh was killed in the battle, severing his confederation and the Anglo-Indian alliance. However, Indian rage persisted elsewhere, particularly in the southeast, where the Creek War erupted in 1813 between Creek Indian nativists (known as Red Sticks) and US forces. Late in the year, US forces evacuating the Niagara Peninsula razed the Canadian village of Newark, prompting British commander Gordon Drummond to retaliate along the New York border, leaving communities such as Buffalo in smoldering ruins.

Early in the war, officers such as Isaac Hull, Stephen Decatur, and William Bainbridge commanded heavy frigates in impressive single-ship actions, boosting sagging American morale. The British Admiralty responded by instructing captains to avoid individual battles with Americans, and within a year, the Royal Navy had blockaded key American ports, suffocating American frigates. British Adm. George Cockburn also conducted raids on the Chesapeake Bay shores. Britain extended its blockade from New England to Georgia in 1814, and forces led by John Sherbrooke took over parts of Maine.

Capable American officers such as Jacob Brown, Winfield Scott, and Andrew Jackson had replaced ineffective veterans of the American Revolution by 1814. Jackson defeated the Red Stick Creeks at the Battle of Horseshoe Bend in Alabama on March 27, 1814, effectively ending the Creek War. Brig. Gen. Phineas Riall advanced to challenge the American invasion after Brown crossed the Niagara River and took Fort Erie that spring, but American regulars led by Scott repulsed him at the Battle of Chippewa (July 5, 1814). In turn, Brown retreated when Commodore Isaac Chauncey's Lake Ontario squadron failed to meet the army, and the war's costliest engagement occurred during this retreat at the Battle of Lundy's Lane (July

25). Before Brown's army withdrew to Fort Erie, Riall, reinforced by Drummond, fought the Americans to a bloody stalemate in which each side suffered over 800 casualties.

Napoleon's defeat in 1814 opened the way for large British forces to arrive in America. That summer, veterans led by Canadian governor-general George Prevost marched south along Lake Champlain's shores into New York, but they returned to Canada after Thomas Macdonough defeated a British squadron led by Captain George Downie at the Battle of Plattsburgh Bay, New York (September 11, 1814). Adm. Alexander Cochrane's British raids in Chesapeake Bay were more successful. British General Robert Ross took control of Washington on August 24 and set fire to government buildings, including the United States Capitol and the Executive Mansion (now known as the White House). The British justified this action as retaliation for the previous year's American destruction of York (modern Toronto), the capital of Upper Canada. The British assault on Baltimore (September 12–14) was thwarted when Americans repelled an attack at Northpoint and held off a naval bombardment of Fort McHenry, an action that inspired Francis Scott Key's "The Star-Spangled Banner." Ross was assassinated in Baltimore, and the British departed Chesapeake Bay to plan an offensive against New Orleans.

Meanwhile, New England Federalist dissatisfaction had been a source of contention throughout the war, and in 1814, some New England radicals discussed seceding from the Union and negotiating peace with England on their own. Such rhetoric was the product of a small minority, but it tarnished the reputation of all Federalists in the eyes of the public. As New Orleans faced capture in late 1814, Massachusetts called for a convention to assemble in Hartford, Connecticut. The meeting's aim was unknown, but it was most certainly not patriotic. The Hartford Convention proved that it was less militant than expected when it eventually adjourned and presented the results of its labors. The final report of the convention, which largely asked for constitutional modifications to restore Federalist authority, was moderate. These pronouncements, as modest as they were, came at the worst possible time for the Federalist Party. The news of Jackson's triumph in New Orleans and the Ghent peace treaty caused the press and public to portray the convention as deceitful and stupid. In the 1816 presidential election, the Federalists would nominate their final presidential candidate, who would be soundly beaten by Republican contender James Monroe, and their congressional numbers would plummet to insignificance. The Federalists ceased to exist as a viable political party only a few years after the war.

The Russian tsar offered to mediate immediately after the war began. London refused, but early British efforts for an armistice revealed a willingness to negotiate in order for Britain to focus solely on Napoleon. The talks began in August 1814 in Ghent (modern Belgium), but with France defeated, the British stalled

while waiting for news of a decisive victory in America. Most Britons were outraged that the United States had unwittingly become Napoleon's ally, but even that was tempered in a country that had been at war in Europe for more than 20 years. As a result, the British government moved to make peace after learning of Plattsburgh and Baltimore, and on the advice of the Duke of Wellington, commander of the British army at the Battle of Waterloo. The Americans dropped their demands to end impressment (the end of the European war meant the end of it anyway), and the British abandoned plans to change the Canadian border and establish an Indian barrier state in the Northwest. On December 24, 1814, the commissioners signed a treaty. The Treaty of Ghent did not resolve the issues that had caused the war, but Britain was too tired to win it at that point, and the US government deemed not losing it a tolerable substitute for victory. Nonetheless, many Americans believed they had won the competition.

Unaware of the treaty, British forces led by Edward Pakenham attacked New Orleans on January 8, 1815, and were soundly defeated by Andrew Jackson's ragtag army, contributing to the notion of a U.S. victory. The United States ratified the treaty unanimously. The Senate's approval of the Treaty of Ghent and the subsequent celebrations obscured the fact that the United States had achieved none of its goals.

Conclusion

This chapter have provided an informative background on the 1812 war comprising the period 1802-1811 when the conflict between Britain and Napoleon escalated becoming an economic warfare which would create the factors that would make the war a reality. Then, Chapter II stated those reasons causing the war, those official were impressment, Britain's supporting Native Americans especially with weapons and the British blockade of American trade issuing decrees harmful to us economy. The unofficial reasons were the War Hawks and their insistence on waging war against Britain in addition to America's underlying desire to conquer Canada. Finally, this chapter recounts the war course shedding light on its major battles and most impactful events until it was ended by The Treaty of Ghent.

Chapter three

Post-war development of American expansion in accordance with war outcomes

Introduction

The war had a many geopolitical changes, even if the war resulted in no change of borders to the combatant sides, it however had few significant outcomes that this chapter will attempt to highlight, explain their significance and how every one of them managed to effect American expansion westward after the war.

1-Nationalism:

The War of 1812 was, in some ways, a second War of Independence, because the United States had not yet been granted equality in the family of nations. Following the signing of the treaty that ended the war, the United States was never again denied the treatment due to an independent nation. Most of the serious difficulties that the young republic had faced since the Revolution had now faded from view. With national union achieved, a balance of liberty and order established, a minor national debt, and a virgin continent awaiting the plough, a peaceful prospect of peace, prosperity, and social progress opened up.

The news of the signing of the treaty of peace and the great victory at New Orleans came as a reprieve from doom to James Madison's administration and the people of the harassed nation. Six months earlier, the secession of New England, the redrawing of national borders, and the virtual loss of independence had all seemed possible. Everything had changed now. The defeats and disappointments of previous years were forgotten, and no one cared that the peace treaty made no mention of the freedom of the seas, which had been the source of the original dispute. Men who had doubted the future of American institutions breathed freely again, and spoke of the Constitution and the union in terms that had become the stuff of heroic legends in other countries and times. The emergence of the spirit of nationalism in many ways was a central feature of the years following the Second World War with England.

It was entirely natural that the quickening of the national spirit and the growth of national consciousness throughout the United States in the period 1815-1830 had as one of their outcomes the extension of the territory of the United States to its natural limits at some point or another.

Physical geography has always played a significant role in national political development. A geographical unity is the natural territorial basis of a national state. That is, it is a territory separated from other territory by large bodies of water, high mountain ranges, broad belts of uninhabitable country, or climatic extremes, but with a reasonable degree of coherence within. If a national state develops on any other part of such a territory, it will inevitably tend to spread to the territory's natural limits. It will not become a completely

national state until it has attained such boundaries, because a completely national state is the sovereign organization of a people with ethnic unity on a geographically united territory.

Politically, this was an "era of good feeling," as contemporaries called it, and a spirit of unity pervaded the post-peace reconstruction measures. Commerce was tying the American people together as a single entity. The privations of the war period demonstrated the importance of safeguarding American manufacturing until it could stand alone against foreign competition. Economic independence, it was argued, was just as important as political independence; indeed, political independence was hardly a reality without economic self-sufficiency, and just as the Revolutionary War was fought for the former, it was now proposed to win the latter. Congressional leaders at the time, Henry Clay and John C. Calhoun, believed in "protection," or the passage of a tariff that allowed American industry to develop.

It was a good time to raise the customs tariff. The shepherds of Vermont and Ohio wished to be protected from an influx of English wool; in Kentucky, a new industry of weaving local hemp into cotton bagging was threatened by the Scotch bagging industry; and Pittsburgh, already a thriving iron smelting center, was eager to fill the demand now adequately supplied by British and Swedish iron. As a result, the tariff enacted in 1816 imposed rates of duty that were high enough to give manufacturers a taste of true protection. Furthermore, proponents of a national network of roads and canals argued that better transportation would strengthen ties between the east and west.

The frontier was another force that shaped American life more than any other single factor. Conditions along the entire Atlantic coast encouraged migration to newer areas. In competition with the cheap and fertile western lands, the soil of New England's hillsides was incapable of producing grain. Soon after, a steady stream of men and women left their coastal farms and villages to exploit the rich lands in the interior. Conditions induced migration in the south as well. People in the back settlements of the Carolinas and Virginia were hampered by a lack of roads and canals providing access to coastal markets, as well as by the tidewater planters' political dominance. As a result, they, too, moved slowly but steadily from the Atlantic to the Rockies. This movement had a profound impact on the American character: it encouraged individual initiative; it paved the way for political and economic democracy; it roughened manners; it shattered conservatism; and it bred a spirit of local self-determination combined with respect for national authority.

The westward stream flowed without pause beyond the first frontier the Atlantic coast strip beyond the headwaters of coastal rivers, and over the Appalachians. By 1800, the Mississippi and Ohio

valleys had developed into a great frontier region, and the song "Hi-o, away we go, floating down the river on the O-hi-o" had become a favorite of thousands of emigrants. The enormous shift in population in the early nineteenth century resulted in the division of old territories and the rapid drawing of new boundaries. The political map was then stabilized east of the Mississippi as new states were admitted. Six states were formed within a half-dozen years: Indiana in 1816, Mississippi in 1817, Illinois in 1818, Alabama in 1819, Maine in 1820, and Missouri in 1821. The first frontier was closely linked to Europe, and the second to coast settlements, but the Mississippi Valley was independent, and its people looked west rather than east.

The frontier settlers were, predictably, a diverse group of men. The hunter and trapper, as described by an English traveler named Fordham, marched in the emigration van "a daring, hardy race of men who live in squalor.... They are unpolished but hospitable, kind to strangers, honest, and trustworthy. They grow some Indian corn, pumpkins, hogs, and occasionally a cow or two, but the rifle is their main source of income." These men were skilled with an ax, a snare, and a fishing line; they blazed the trails, built the first log cabins, and kept the Indians at bay.

The settler became a farmer as well as a hunter as he moved deeper into the wilderness. He built a comfortable log house with glass windows, a good chimney, and partitioned rooms instead of a cabin. He dug a well instead of using a spring. A hardworking man would clear his land of timber quickly, burning the wood for potash and letting the stumps decay. He grew his own grain, vegetables, and fruit; hunted venison, wild turkeys, and honey in the woods; fished the nearby streams; and cared for his cattle and hogs. The more restless bought large tracts of cheap land and, as land values rose, sold their acres and moved westward, allowing others to take their place.

Along with the farmers, doctors, lawyers, storekeepers, editors, preachers, mechanics, and politicians soon arrived, forming the fabric of a thriving society. Farmers were the most influential. They intended to live where they had settled for the rest of their lives, and they hoped that their children would do the same. They built larger barns and sound brick or frame houses than their forefathers. They imported better livestock, plowed the land more efficiently, and sowed more productive seed. Some built flour mills, sawmills, and distilleries. They built churches and schools, as well as good highways. The west grew so quickly that almost unbelievable transformations occurred in only a few years. In 1830, for example, Chicago was merely a mediocre trading village with a fort. Long before some of its original settlers died, it was one of the world's largest and wealthiest cities.

In the new west, many different peoples mixed their blood. Farmers of the upland south were prominent, and Abraham Lincoln, born in a Kentucky log cabin, descended from this line. Scotch-Irish, Pennsylvania Germans, New Englanders, and other men played important roles. By 1830, more than half of the people in America had been raised in an environment where old world traditions and conventions were either absent or very weak. And men in the west were valued not for their family background, inherited wealth, or years of education, but for who they were and what they could do. Farms could be had for a price well within the means of any thrifty individual, and government land after 1820 could be obtained for \$1.25 an acre and, after 1862, for simply settling on it. In addition, tools for working the land were readily available. It was a time when young men could "go west and grow up with the country," as journalist Horace Greeley put it. The equality of economic opportunity fostered a sense of social and political equality, allowing natural leaders to emerge quickly. The good pioneer required initiative, courage, individual vigor, and hard sense.

The rise of a large cotton-growing industry in the south was one factor in the economic change. This shift was brought about by a number of factors. Cotton varieties with improved fibers were introduced. Eli Whitney's seminal invention of the "gin" for cleaning cotton seeds in 1793 greatly accelerated production. At the same time, the Industrial Revolution, which made textile manufacturing a large-scale industry, greatly increased demand for raw cotton. And, following 1812, the opening of new lands in the west greatly expanded the area available for cotton growing.

Cotton culture spread rapidly westward from the tidewater states, through much of the lower south to the Mississippi River, and eventually to Texas. Sugar production was another factor that gave slavery a new lease on life. In the late eighteenth century, the rich, hot lands of southeastern Louisiana proved ideal for growing a profitable sugarcane crop, and by 1830, the state supplied roughly half of the nation's sugar supply. This necessitated the transport of slaves from the eastern seaboard. Finally, tobacco culture spread westward, bringing with it slavery. As a result, the slaves of the upper south were largely dispersed to the lower south and west.

As the free society of the north and the slave society of the south spread westward, it seemed politically expedient to maintain a rough equality between the newly formed states. When Illinois was admitted to the Union in 1818, ten states allowed slavery and eleven Free states prohibited it. The balance was restored when Alabama was admitted as a slave state. Many northerners quickly banded together to oppose Missouri's admission except as a free state, and a storm of protest swept the country. For a time, Congress was unable to reach an agreement. However, under Henry Clay's pacific leadership, a

compromise was reached. Missouri was admitted as a slave state, but Maine was admitted as a free state at the same time, and Congress declared that slavery would be prohibited in the territory acquired by the Louisiana Purchase north of Missouri's southern boundary for the rest of time. This was only a short-term solution. The fire bell in the night had been silenced for the time being, according to Jefferson. "This is a reprieve only," he wrote, "'not a final sentence." A geographic line, coinciding with a marked principle, moral and political, once conceived and held up to the angry passion of men, will never be obliterated; and every new irritation will mark it deeper and deeper. "

Except for a migration into Texas beyond the borders of the United States, the agricultural frontier did not pass-through Missouri until after 1840. Meanwhile, the far west became a highly active area in the fur trade, which would have far-reaching historical implications far beyond the value of the skins collected. As in the early days of French exploration in the Mississippi Valley, and indeed in the early steps of the English and Dutch westward from the Atlantic Coast, the trader served as a guide for the settlers. The French and Scotch-Irish "trappers" explored the great rivers and their tributaries, discovering all of the Rockies and Sierra passes. The traders' knowledge of the geography of the western regions enabled the overland migrations of the 1940s and later occupation of the interior. In addition to westward emigration, the United States obtained from Spain in 1819, in exchange for assuming the claims of American citizens to the tune of \$5,000,000, both Florida and Spain's rights to the Oregon country in the far west.

The Rise of Jackson:

Domestic attention was focused on the upcoming presidential campaign. A close election between five candidates, including New Orleans hero Andrew Jackson, resulted in the election of the learned, experienced, and statesmanlike but stubbornly intractable John Quincy Adams. He was hampered by his icy austerity, brusque manners, and violent prejudices, despite his extraordinary talents, fine character, and great public spirit.

During his presidency, new party alliances emerged. The Adams supporters adopted the name National Republicans, which was later replaced by Whigs, and the Jacksonians gave the Democratic Party a new face. Adams governed with integrity and efficiency. He did, however, try in vain to establish a national system of roads and canals. His presidency was one long campaign for the next election, but his cold intellectual temperament did not win him many friends, and the election of 1828 was like an earthquake, with Jackson forces overwhelming Adams and his supporters.

The self-sufficient backwoodsmen who built the commonwealths west of the Alleghenies incorporated frontier democratic ideas into their constitutions. By 1828, the influence of their philosophy had resulted in mass enfranchisement in the majority of the old states. The west had held the balance of power in the Union since the War of 1812. As the west's youthful democracy matured, the political center of gravity, like the population center, shifted away from the seaboard. It placed Jackson, the very personification of the frontier spirit, in the Chief Executive's chair, with the help of supporters in the east.

Jackson was completely with the common people, heart and soul. He was born in abject poverty; his father having died before he was born. Because he was raised in poverty, he developed a keen sensitivity and a lifelong sympathy for the oppressed. As a man who fought in the Revolutionary War, in which his two brothers were killed. He was fourteen years old and completely alone in the world. As a frontier lawyer, planter, and merchant, he developed a deep distrust of the eastern financial organizations that wielded considerable power over much western commerce. Furthermore, Jackson believed in the common man's ability to achieve extraordinary things. Overall, his creed was simple and all-encompassing: he believed in the common man and political equality, in equal economic opportunity, and he despised monopoly and special privilege.

Washington, D. C., at Jackson's inauguration, provided boisterous evidence of the people's conviction that they had taken control of the government. Ten thousand visitors from all over the country flocked to see the event. Jackson, a tall, lean figure dressed in black with a hawk-like face beneath a magnificent crest of thick white hair, walked up Pennsylvania Avenue alone, except for a small group of friends. He took the oath of office and read his inaugural address from the top of the great stone stairway leading to the Capitol's east portico. He pushed his way through the yelling crowds, all eager to shake his hand. Mounting his horse, he led an informal procession of carriages, farm wagons, and crowds of people of all ages and types to the White House.

Jackson and Battle of New Orleans:

On December 24, 1814, the United Kingdom and the United States signed a treaty in Ghent, Belgium, effectively putting an end to the War of 1812. However, word spread slowly across the Atlantic, and on January 8, 1815, the two sides met in what is remembered as one of the conflict's largest and most decisive engagements. Future President Andrew Jackson and a motley crew of militia fighters, frontiersmen, slaves, Indians, and even pirates withstood a frontal assault by a superior British force,

inflicting devastating casualties along the way. The victory catapulted Jackson to national prominence and helped thwart British plans for an invasion of the American frontier.

Major General Andrew Jackson, who had rushed to New Orleans' defense when he learned of an impending attack, stood in the way of the British advance. Jackson, nicknamed "Old Hickory" because of his legendary toughness, had spent the previous year subduing hostile Creek Indians in Alabama and harassing redcoat operations along the Gulf Coast. The General despised the British because he had been imprisoned by them during the Revolutionary War, and he was eager to face them in battle. "I owe Britain a debt of retaliatory vengeance," he once told his wife, "Should our forces meet I trust I shall pay the debt."

Following the sighting of British forces near Lake Borgne, Jackson declared martial law in New Orleans and ordered that every available weapon and able-bodied man be brought to bear in the city's defense. His force quickly grew to 4,500 soldiers, frontier militiamen, free blacks, New Orleans aristocrats, and Choctaw tribesmen. After some hesitation, Old Hickory agreed to accept the assistance of Jean Lafitte, a daring pirate who ran a smuggling and privateering empire from nearby Barataria Bay. Jackson's ragtag army would be pitted against 8,000 British regulars, many of whom had served in the Napoleonic Wars. Lieutenant General Sir Edward Pakenham, a respected veteran of the Peninsular War and the Duke of Wellington's brother-in-law, was in command.

On December 23, Jackson launched a daring nighttime attack on British forces camped nine miles south of New Orleans, and the two sides first clashed. Jackson then returned to Rodriguez Canal, a ten-foot-wide millrace off the Mississippi River near Chalmette Plantation. He widened the canal into a defensive trench with local slave labor and used the excess dirt to construct a seven-foot-tall earthen rampart buttressed with timber. When finished, this "Line Jackson" stretched nearly a mile from the Mississippi's east bank to a nearly impassable marsh. "Here we shall plant our stakes and not abandon them until we drive these red-coat rascals into the river or the swamp," Jackson told his men.

Lieutenant General Pakenham:

Despite their formidable defenses, Lieutenant General Pakenham believed the "dirty shirts," as the British dubbed the Americans, would crumble in the face of a British army in formation. He devised a strategy for a two-part frontal assault after a skirmish on December 28 and a massive artillery duel on New Year's Day. A small force was tasked with crossing to the Mississippi's west bank and seizing an American battery. They were to turn the guns on the Americans and catch Jackson in a punishing crossfire once they

had them. Simultaneously, a larger force of 5,000 men would charge forward in two columns and crush the main American line at the Rodriguez Canal.

Pakenham put his plan into action on January 8 at dawn. The sound of a Congreve rocket whistling overhead elicited a cheer from the red-coated hordes, who then advanced toward the American line. The British batteries opened up in force, only to be met with an angry barrage from Jackson's 24 artillery pieces, some of which were manned by Jean Lafitte's pirates. While Pakenham's main force moved closer to the swamp on the canal, British light troops led by Colonel Robert Rennie advanced along the riverbank and overwhelmed an isolated redoubt, scattering its American defenders. Rennie had just enough time to yell, "Hurrah, boys, the day is ours!" before being shot dead by Line Jackson's salvo of rifle fire. With their commander gone, his men fled in haste, only to be slain in a hail of musket balls and grapeshot.

The situation on the other side of the line was even worse. Pakenham had planned to move through the morning mist, but the fog had risen with the sun, providing American rifle and artillerymen with clear sightlines. Cannon fire soon began slashing gaping holes in the British line, launching men and equipment into the air. The British troops' ranks were riddled with musket shot as they advanced. From a vantage point near the right side of the line, General Jackson yelled, "Give it to them, my boys! Let us finish the business today!" Old Hickory's militiamen, who had honed their aim while hunting in the frontier woods, fired with sickening precision. With each American volley, red-coated soldiers fell in waves, many with multiple wounds. One astounded British officer later compared the American rampart to "a row of fiery furnaces."

British Lose Ground at the Battle of New Orleans:

Pakenham's plan was coming apart at the seams. His men had bravely held their ground in the midst of the American deluge, but a unit carrying the ladders and wood fascines required to scale Line Jackson was lagging behind. Pakenham took the initiative to lead the outfit to the front, but his main formation was cut to ribbons by rifle and cannon fire in the meantime. When some of the redcoats fled, one of Pakenham's subordinates foolishly attempted to wheel the 93rd Highlanders Regiment to their aid. American troops quickly took aim and unleashed a hail of bullets that took out more than half of the unit, including the leader. Pakenham and his entourage were laced with grapeshot around the same time. Minutes later, the British commander died.

With the majority of their officers out of the picture, the British attack devolved into chaos. A few brave troops attempted to scale the parapets by hand, only to retreat when they discovered they had no

support. Pakenham's secondary assault on Jackson's battery across the river had been more successful, but it was too late. The British could see the day was already lost by the time they seized the American artillery position. The British were retreating in droves at Line Jackson, leaving a carpet of crumpled bodies in their wake. Major Howell Tatum of the United States later stated that the enemy casualties were "truly distressing...some had their heads shot off, some their legs, some their arms. Some were laughing, some were crying... there was every variety of sight and sound."

Battle of New Orleans Casualties:

The British suffered 2,000 casualties, including three generals and seven colonels, during the assault on Jackson's fortifications, which lasted only 30 minutes. Surprisingly, Jackson's motley crew had lost less than 100 men. "History records no example of so glorious a victory obtained with so little bloodshed on the part of the victorious.," future President James Monroe would later say of the General. The stunned British army remained in Louisiana for several days, but its remaining officers knew that any chance of taking the Crescent City had passed them by. The British boarded their ships and sailed back into the Gulf of Mexico after an abortive naval attack on nearby Fort St. Philip.

Impact of the Battle of New Orleans

Andrew Jackson returned to New Orleans shortly before the British withdrawal to the sounds of "Yankee Doodle" and a public celebration worthy of Mardi Gras. Newspapers in the troubled city of Washington, D.C. dubbed him the nation's savior. The celebrations only lasted until the Treaty of Ghent reached American shores the following month. When Congress ratified the treaty on February 16, 1815, the War of 1812 was officially over. The conflict is now considered to have ended in a stalemate, but the victory at New Orleans had elevated national pride to such a level that many Americans regarded it as a win at the time. Jackson, who would later ride his newfound celebrity all the way to the White House, was no doubt among them. Addressing his troops shortly after the battle, he hailed their "undaunted courage" in saving the country from invasion and said, "Natives of different states, acting together, for the first time in this camp...have reaped the fruits of an honorable union."

Jackson and the Native Americans

Removal was sometimes portrayed as a kind act. For example, Lewis Cass, the governor of the Michigan Territory from 1813 to 1831, believed that relocating Indians to territories west of the Mississippi River would be the only way to ensure Native American survival in the face of encroaching American

settlement. Cass's role in negotiating the Treaty of Fort Meigs (1817) signaled the formal cession of all Indian territory in the Ohio Valley, regardless of his reasoning. Cass, the then-US Secretary of War, wrote in 1836 that "the Indians now holding lands in the vicinity of Green Bay can only be considered as temporary residents there." According to people like Cass, the Mississippi River would become the new dividing line between Native and US settlement. Less than a century before, at the end of the French and Indian War, the British proposed a dividing line as far east as the Appalachian Mountains. The Americans were planning on expanding their territory.

With President Andrew Jackson's election in 1828, the adoption of Indian westward removal as official federal policy became a foregone conclusion. Implementing the Indian Removal Act (1830) became one of Jackson's top priorities, as he sought to develop the region west of the Appalachians. Jackson was a frontiersman from Tennessee and a famous Indian fighter. Some tribal communities attempted to avoid removal and maintain their territorial integrity by modeling their lives after Americans in order to demonstrate their ability to peacefully coexist and successfully adopt their white neighbors' "civilized" and Christian ways. Jackson, on the other hand, was skeptical of Indian incorporation into American society and ultimately believed that Native Americans hampered the development of the trans-Appalachian region and posed a threat as potential allies for the British.

The Indian Removal Act authorized the negotiation of treaties in which Indian lands in the east were exchanged for land in the unorganized territories of the trans-Mississippi West. Many Native communities were deeply divided over the prospect of removal, with some tribal members vehemently opposing it and others hoping to actively negotiate the best terms possible in light of what they saw as an unavoidable process of forced relocation. Some groups did voluntarily relocate west in response to significant external pressure; such stories complicate the dominant historical narrative, which holds that the United States simply swept away the remnants of Indian communities in the east. Nonetheless, the United States military and volunteer militiamen forcibly uprooted many communities that refused to move westward across the Mississippi River.

Within three decades of the War of 1812, the Indian removal policy had drastically altered the map of Native America and traumatized entire indigenous communities. The haunting stories of the forced removal of tens of thousands of Indians from their homelands, such as the Cherokee Trail of Tears, were a direct result of the outcome of the War of 1812 and the shifts in power in North America. The removal policy aided in the dispersion of tribal communities beyond their original homelands. For example, forced migration helps to explain why Potawatomi communities can now be found in four states: Kansas,

Oklahoma, Wisconsin, and Michigan. However, removal of Indians from the Great Lakes region was neither complete nor unavoidable. Indeed, after the Americans took control of the region, many Native Americans resisted removal. Even after being forced to relocate to Nebraska, many Ho-Chunks, for example, returned east to Wisconsin.

The removal era was also a time of Indian land cessions. Faced with the prospect of military force, many tribes in the Great Lakes region agreed to drastically reduce their land base. Rather than being forced westward, many Native Americans were exiled to isolated reservations that were generally unsuitable for white agricultural purposes. When faced with such removal and land cession pressures, Native communities were frequently sharply divided. By 1867, nearly the entire Ojibwe homeland had been taken through a series of treaties in Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, with the exception of a handful of small reservations.

Indian Treaties and the Removal Act of 1830

The United States used treaties as one method of displacing Indians from their tribal lands, a mechanism that was bolstered by the Removal Act of 1830. In cases where this did not work, the government would sometimes violate both treaties and Supreme Court rulings to aid in the spread of European Americans westward across the continent.

As the nineteenth century began, land-hungry Americans poured into the coastal South's backcountry, moving toward and into what would later become the states of Alabama and Mississippi. Because the Indian tribes who lived there appeared to be the main impediment to westward expansion, white settlers petitioned the federal government to have them removed. Despite the fact that Presidents Thomas Jefferson and James Monroe argued that Indian tribes in the Southeast should exchange their land for lands west of the Mississippi River, they did not take any steps to make this happen. Indeed, the first major land transfer occurred only as a result of war.

Major General Andrew Jackson led an expedition against the Creek Indians in 1814, which culminated in the Battle of Horse Shoe Bend (in present-day Alabama near the Georgia border), where Jackson's force soundly defeated the Creeks and destroyed their military power. He then forced the Indians to sign a treaty in which they surrendered over twenty million acres of their traditional land to the United States—roughly half of present-day Alabama and one-fifth of Georgia. Over the next decade, Jackson led the Indian removal campaign, assisting in the negotiation of nine of the eleven major treaties for the removal of Indians.

Under such pressure, Native American tribes, specifically the Creek, Cherokee, Chickasaw, and Choctaw, realized they could not defeat the Americans in battle. The settlers' desire for land was unquenchable, so the Indians devised an appeasement strategy. They hoped that if they gave up a large portion of their land, they would be able to keep at least a portion of it. The Seminole tribe in Florida resisted, but neither appeasement nor resistance worked in the Second Seminole War (1835–1842) and the Third Seminole War (1855–1858).

From a legal standpoint, Congress was given the authority to "regulate commerce with foreign nations, among the several States, and with Indian tribes." Early treaties negotiated between the federal government and Indian tribes typically stated that they were "under the protection of the United States of America, and of no other sovereign whosoever." When Andrew Jackson became president (1829–1837), he decided to use these legal precedents to build a systematic approach to Indian removal.

Jackson persuaded Congress to pass the Removal Act of 1830 in order to achieve his goal. The Act established a procedure by which the President could grant land west of the Mississippi River to Indian tribes that agreed to relinquish their homelands. As an inducement, the law provided the Indians with financial and material assistance to travel to their new locations and begin new lives, as well as a guarantee that the Indians would live on their new property forever under the protection of the United States Government. With the Act in place, Jackson and his supporters could persuade, bribe, and threaten tribes into signing removal treaties and leaving the Southeast.

In general, Jackson's administration was a success. By the end of his presidency, he had signed nearly seventy removal treaties into law, resulting in the relocation of nearly 50,000 eastern Indians to Indian Territory (defined as the region belonging to the United States west of the Mississippi River but excluding the states of Missouri and Iowa, as well as the Territory of Arkansas) and the opening of millions of acres of rich land east of the Mississippi to white settlers. Despite the vastness of Indian Territory, the government intended for the Indians to settle in a more constrained area—what became eastern Oklahoma.

The Trail of Tears (Robert Lindneux, 1942)

The Cherokee Nation, on the other hand, resisted, taking to court the Georgia laws that limited their freedoms on tribal lands. Chief Justice John Marshall stated in his 1831 decision in *Cherokee Nation v. the State of Georgia* that "the Indian territory is admitted to compose a part of the United States," and that the tribes were "domestic dependent nations" whose "relation to the United States resembles that of a ward to his guardian." However, the Supreme Court reversed itself the following year, ruling that Indian

tribes were indeed sovereign and immune from Georgia laws. Despite this, President Jackson refused to accept the Court's decision. In the Treaty of New Echota, which Congress ratified in 1835 despite the protests of Daniel Webster and Henry Clay, he obtained the signature of a Cherokee chief agreeing to relocation. The Cherokee signing party was only a fraction of the Cherokee, and the majority of the Cherokee followed Principal Chief John Ross in a desperate attempt to keep their land. This attempt failed in 1838, when the Cherokee tribe was forced to the dry plains across the Mississippi by federal troops and Georgia state militia. The best evidence suggests that between three and four thousand Cherokees died on route as a result of the harsh conditions of the "Trail of Tears."

With the exception of a small number of Seminoles still resisting removal in Florida, there were no Indian tribes in the American South by the 1840s, from the Atlantic to the Mississippi. The United States Government was successful in paving the way for westward expansion and the incorporation of new territories as part of the United States through a combination of coerced treaties, treaty contravention, and judicial determination.

The loss of British support:

The end of the peace talks in Ghent signaled the end of the Indian-British alliance in North America. Britons and Indians realized that the days of their combined forces controlling the Great Lakes and holding the keys to the continent were over. As Britain sought power and prosperity elsewhere, the United States gradually transformed its nominal hegemony into reality, and Indians developed alternative survival strategies such as migration or cultural adaptation.

The Indian confederacy was doomed as a result of the war and Tecumseh's death. Within three years, all of the continent south of the 49th parallel and east of the Mississippi River had been granted statehood or territorial status (except for what remained of Spanish Florida). By the end of the decade, a growing number of settlers, gold prospectors, buffalo hunters, fortune seekers, and freebooters of all kinds had pushed their way to the Missouri River and beyond. The Indian nations in their path either fled west as refugees being relocated to assigned reservations, or were slaughtered by the army. This pattern would continue until America declared victory over the West. Only a remainder of the peoples from whom a continent was taken survived.

Britain did not reclaim any territory for its allies. The British commanders in the Great Lakes region attempted to persuade the Indians to accept peace terms that fell far short of what had been promised. The natives would not reclaim the territory north and west of the Ohio River, and the British would keep

the key fort at Michilimackinac. Instead, the Indians had to settle for a hazy promise that they would be restored to their 1811 possessions, and they had to put their faith in their bitter enemies, the Americans, to keep that promise. Given British gifts and empty promises, enraged chiefs branded the British officers liars and deceivers. Little Crow, a Lakota chief, said:

" After we have fought for you, endured many hardships, lost some of our people and awakened the vengeance of our powerful neighbors, you make peace for yourselves, leaving us to obtain such terms as we can. You no longer need our service; you offer us these goods to pay us for having deserted us. But no, we will not take them; we will hold them and yourselves in equal contempt".

Native Americans sought assistance from the British in order to resist trade restrictions. British officers sympathized with the Native Americans but were powerless to intervene. Sir Gordon Drummond, Canada's new governor-general, expressed a painful sense of dilemma: " Many of our faithful allies will apply for succor in their distress. If it is refused them, we force them into the power of their bitterest enemies. If it is granted them, we inevitably bring on another rupture between ourselves and the United States." Drummond was forced to obey London's restraining orders, which he imposed on his subordinates in the Indian country. The British chose to withdraw from their alliance.

Despite losing the northern war to conquer Canada, the Americans won the western war to subdue the Indian resistance. They had killed Tecumseh, their most formidable Indian adversary and the chief proponent of native unity and resistance, at the Battle of the Thames in 1813. Andrew Jackson used superior numbers to defeat the Creeks in Alabama in 1814. He then forced them to sign away over 20 million acres of land, which amounted to more than half of their domain. Despite the fact that the Treaty of Ghent committed the Americans to restoring Indians to their prewar lands, they received nothing in return.

The mutually beneficial alliance that began during the French and Indian War had come to an end after the fighting in the War of 1812 was over. The British capitulated in response to American pressure. The British were no longer allowed to trade with the Indians who lived within the new American borders. When a British diplomat complained, John Quincy Adams responded, "A bitter experience of thirty years had proved that all the Indian Wars in which we had been involved, had been kindled by the pestilential breath of British agents and Traders."

Native Americans were being relocated, but they did show some resistance. The Cherokee Tribe, who had adopted American farming techniques and Christianity, were still driven from their homes. Andrew Jackson would forcibly relocate them along the "Trail of Tears." The Black Hawk War occurred

in Illinois, but it was over in a year. Other tribes, such as the Seminoles, would fight back, but there was never the same Native American unity among all tribes on the continent as there was during Tecumseh's reign. Native Americans were being pushed onto reservations even in Canada. Native Americans in Upper Canada faced increasing pressure to give up their lands. Upper Canada's population more than doubled from 75,000 in 1815 to 150,000 by 1824, far outnumbering the 8,000 Native Americans. Over 7.3 million acres were ceded to Canada between 1815 and 1824. By the mid-1820s, the majority of the colony's natives were confined to reserves resembling American reservations.

The destruction of the warrior culture that had previously been defended in Upper Canada was further proof that the alliance had ended. Native Americans were coerced into accepting Christianity and adopting European agricultural practices. Prior to the war, no British lieutenant governor would have supported the American policy of enslaving, dispossessing, and transforming the Indians. However, after the war, Upper Canada's Indian policy resembled that of the United States. This convergence made it easier for the British to abandon their alliance with the Indians on the American side of the border.

The War of 1812 was the Native Americans' last chance to save their way of life, but it was not to be. The British-Indian alliance, which had been so powerful since the French and Indian War, had come to an end. Native Americans would never be able to reclaim their ancestral lands or live in the same way again. They would be pushed onto reservations in both the United States and Canada with reluctance.

Conclusion

This chapter has clarified the kind of relation between the 1812 war and the accelerated expansion following it by explaining how such war outcomes as Nationalism, the Rise of Andrew Jackson and the British Indian alliance coming to an end laid effect on the American expansion by bolstering the sense of nationalism in the mindset of the American people and expressing it through settling west, making radical policies and decisions against Native Americans in favor of facilitating white settlement west and finally eliminating the British support for Indians leaving them armless and hopeless against the aggressiveness of American encroachment westward.

General conclusion

General Conclusion

This research paper sought to investigate whether the 1812 war had an effect on American expansion or not. The investigation was based on the qualitative analysis of three main outcomes of the war, Nationalism the rise of Andrew Jackson to the presidency and the end of the British-Indian alliance. Moreover, through analyzing the impact of every one of those outcomes, this study has managed to deduce the relation between them and the increase of expansion following the war highlighting in the process the contribution of every war result to that increase.

This study begins with providing illustrations of previous expansion and hegemonic attempts in order to indicate the Expansionist ideals found in the American society. The study also illustrates the reaction to the war by the public later to become even violent and extreme. The trouble and division brought about by the war, even reached the political levels, the latter demise of the federalist party.

Later on, the study provides a background on the 1812 war that explains the kind of context that surrounded America during the Napoleonic wars and the economic inconveniences this conflict brought on America through the policies Britain and Napoleonic France followed such as the Orders in Council. The Milan decree and Berlin decree in order to disrupt each other's economy, inflicting great damage to the American trade in the process. Then the study lists the official and unofficial causes that brought the war closer such as the impressment of American sailors, the economic restrictions laid down by Britain, the British supplying Indians with weaponry to fight Americans, war hungry American politicians or "War Hawks" and the desire to annex Canada. Furthermore, this part recites the war's course of events, its major battles and events.

Finally, the impact of the American British war on America was explained in the finale part by relating the war outcomes; nationalism, Andrew Jackson's rise to presidency and the decline of the British Indian alliance with the later expansionist zeal and confidence was apparent with no mentionable resistance from Indian Americans.

Works Cited

"War of 1812." *Wikipedia*. Wikimedia Foundation, 20 Oct. 2021. Web. 26 Oct. 2021.

"United States." *Ducksters*. Web. 26 Oct. 2021.

"The War of 1812 (article)." *Khan Academy*. Khan Academy. Web. 26 Oct. 2021.

McNamara, Robert. "America Was Deeply Split over Decision to Go to War in 1812." *ThoughtCo*. ThoughtCo, 01 Sept. 2019. Web. 26 Oct. 2021.

The Thirteen Colonies based on an original work of the CoreKnowledge® Foundation (www.coreknowledge.org) made available through licensing under a Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Remini, Robert Vincent. "Discovery and Settlement of the New World." *A Short History of the United States*. New York Etc.: Harper Perennial, 2009. 10-35. Print.

Remini, Robert Vincent. "Independence and Nation Building." *A Short History of the United States*. New York Etc.: Harper Perennial, 2009. 31-37. Print.

Turner, Wesley B. "BACKGROUND TO WAR, 1802-1812." *The War of 1812: The War That Both Sides Won*. Toronto: Dundurn, 2000. Print.

Turner, Wesley B. "BRITISH NORTH AMERICA AND THE UNITED STATES." *The War of 1812: The War That Both Sides Won*. Toronto: Dundurn, 2000. Print.

Heidler, David Stephen, and Jeanne T. Heidler. "HISTORICAL OVERVIEW." *The War of 1812*. Westport, CT: Greenwood, 2002. 1. Print.

Turner, Wesley B. "MARITIME RIGHTS." *The War of 1812: The War That Both Sides Won*. Toronto: Dundurn, 2000. Print.

Heidler, David Stephen, and Jeanne T. Heidler. "HISTORICAL OVERVIEW." *The War of 1812*. Westport, CT: Greenwood, 2002. 02-03. Print.

""War Hawks' Urge Military Confrontation with Britain" (U.S. National Park Service)." National Parks Service. U.S. Department of the Interior. Web. 26 Oct. 2021.

Heidler, David Stephen, and Jeanne T. Heidler. "HISTORICAL OVERVIEW." *The War of 1812*. Westport, CT: Greenwood, 2002. 03-04. Print.

- Turner, Wesley B. "INDIANS OF THE NORTHWEST." *The War of 1812: The War That Both Sides Won*. Toronto: Dundurn, 2000. Print.
- Heidler, David Stephen, and Jeanne T. Heidler. "France and Britain Conduct Economic Warfare." *The War of 1812*. Westport, CT: Greenwood, 2002. 26-27. Print.
- "Prelude to The 1812 War." *The Mariners' Museum : Birth of the U.S. Navy*. Web. 26 Oct. 2021.
- "War of 1812." *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Encyclopædia Britannica, Inc. Web. 26 Oct. 2021.
- Heidler, David Stephen, and Jeanne T. Heidler. "HISTORICAL OVERVIEW." *The War of 1812*. Westport, CT: Greenwood, 2002. 12. Print.
- Breen, Drusilla Agnes. *Aspects of Nationalism in the United States, 1815-1830*. Diss. Loyola U Chicago. Print.
- "Westward Expansion and Regional Differences." *Westward Expansion and Regional Differences*. The Department of Alfa-Informatica of the University of Groningen. Web. 26 Oct. 2021.
- History.com Editors. "Battle of New Orleans." *History.com*. A&E Television Networks, 09 Nov. 2009. Web. 26 Oct. 2021.
- "American Expansion Turns to Official Indian Removal (U.S. National Park Service)." *National Parks Service*. U.S. Department of the Interior. Web. 26 Oct. 2021.
- "Indian Treaties and the Removal Act of 1830." *U.S. Department of State*. U.S. Department of State. Web. 26 Oct. 2021.
- Barrett, Ryan. *The War of 1812: The End of an Uncommon Alliance*. Diss. State U of New York College at Buffalo - Buffalo State College, 2013. Buffalo, NY: State U College at Buffalo, 2013. Print.